

REMARKS

Claims 23, 25 and 29 have been amended.

A Request for Continued Examination (RCE) and a check for \$790 to cover the RCE fee are being filed with this Amendment. Also, a Petition for a 2-Month Extension of Time and a check for \$450 to cover the extension fee payment are being filed herewith. Authorization is granted to charge our deposit account no. 03-3415 for any additional fees necessary for entry of this Amendment.

The Examiner has objected to applicant's specification because the specification makes no mention of the high frequency component oscillating shown in applicant's drawings. Applicant has amended applicants' specification to recite that that "clearness signal changes to have upper and lower peaks, that is, to oscillate, indicated by D2 in Fig 26A." Applicant believes that the amended specification now refers to the oscillation of the high frequency component, thereby overcoming the Examiner's objection.

The Examiner has rejected applicant's claims 23-30 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by the Hirao, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 4,924,317) patent. Applicant has amended applicant's independent claims 23, 25 and 29, and with respect to these claims, as amended, and their respective dependent claims, the Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicant's independent claims 23, 25 and 29 have been amended to better define applicant's invention. In particular, applicant's independent claim 23 has now been amended to recite a moving condition switching means for switching a moving condition of the second lens so that a high frequency component amount of the video signal oscillates, when the first lens

performs the magnification operation. Applicant's independent claims 25 and 29 have been similarly amended.

The constructions recited in applicant's amended independent claims 23, 25 and 29, and their respective dependent claims, are not taught or suggested by the cited art of record. In particular, the Examiner has argued that the Hirao, et al. patent teaches a first lens (zoom lens group 18-1 to 18-3) for performing a magnification operation, a second lens (focus lens 18-4) for correcting movement of a focal plane during movement of said first lens, lens moving means 19 for independently moving the first and second lenses to be parallel to an optical axis, extracting means 4 for extracting a high frequency component Y from a video signal of a photographed object, and first moving condition switching means 5 for switching a moving condition of the second lens during movement of the first lens so that a high frequency component amount of the video signal oscillates (figure 6d-e). The Examiner has directed applicant's attention to Figures 3, 5 and 6 and to Col. 5, line 65 to Col. 7, line 39 of the Hirao, et al. patent.

Applicant has reviewed the portions of the Hirao, et al. patent and believes that the Hirao, et al. patent is completely silent as to switching a moving condition of the second lens so that a high frequency component amount of the video signal oscillates when the first lens performs the magnification operation. This is not described in Col. 5, line 65 to Col. 7, line 39, nor is it shown in Figs. 6a-e, of the Hirao, et al. patent.

The patent does state at Col 6, line 30 that “[t]he auxiliary oscillation is executed in the same cases as in the first embodiment.” The auxiliary oscillation for the first embodiment is described at Col. 3, line 34 through Col. 4, line 7. These passages set forth that the auxiliary oscillation is executed in four cases: “(1) [w]hen electric power is fed to the automatic focusing

system to start the automatic focusing operation”; (2) “[w]hen after the photographic lens is focused by the above in-focus control operation, the object or the video camera move and automatic focusing is to be restarted”; (3) “[w]hen after the photographic lens is focused by the above in-focus control operation and an automatic focusing completed, the period from this completion until restart of automatic focusing”; and (4) [i]n the above in-focus control operation, the period until completion of the automatic focusing”.

All these cases concern the automatic focusing operation of the video camera (see Col 2, line 49 to Col. 3, line 10), and none concern the zooming operation. The Hirao, et al. patent is thus completely silent as to any relationship between performing the oscillation of the focus lens and performing a zooming operation. The Hirao, et al. patent, therefore, makes no mention of switching a moving condition of the focus lens so as to oscillate a high frequency component when the zooming operation is performed. Accordingly, the Hirao, et al. patent does not teach or suggest “switching a moving condition of said second lens so that a high frequency component amount of the video signal oscillates, when said first lens performs the magnification operation”, as recited in applicant’s amended claims.

Applicant’s amended independent claims 23, 25 and 29, and their respective dependent claims, therefore patentably distinguish over the Hirao, et al. patent.

In view of the above, it is submitted that applicant’s claims, as amended, patentably distinguish over the cited references. Accordingly, reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes that an interview would expedite consideration of this Amendment or of the application, a request is made that the Examiner telephone applicant's counsel at (212) 790-9286.

Dated: October 17, 2006

Respectfully submitted,



Anastasia Zhadina
Reg. No. 48,544

COWAN, LIEBOWITZ & LATMAN, P. C.
1133 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036
T (212) 790-9200